

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JONATHAN GABRIELLI,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 24-cv-09533-JST (TSH)

DISCOVERY ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 48


The parties have filed a joint discovery letter brief at ECF No. 48. Plaintiff moves to compel concerning 10 interrogatories and 21 requests for production. In Plaintiff's section of the letter brief, he says essentially nothing about his discovery requests. For example, he does not discuss what documents or information each request seeks or make any arguments about why the requested documents and information are relevant and proportional to the needs of the case. All he does is complain about Motorola's objections. The Court ordered the parties to file Plaintiff's discovery requests and Motorola's responses because it found the parties' discovery dispute difficult to evaluate without them. ECF No. 52. Now having seen the discovery requests, the Court thinks they do require discussion. The 21 requests for production and 10 interrogatories are each accompanied by several pages of definitions and instructions. It is not sufficient for Plaintiff merely to gesture at this big stack of discovery requests; he must set forth arguments about why the discovery he wants is a good idea, which he hasn't done. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to compel is **DENIED** without prejudice to filing one or more proper joint discovery letter briefs in which he explains why the requested discovery is appropriate.

Plaintiff should also be mindful of what can be meaningfully addressed in a five page joint discovery letter brief. Moving on every discovery request all at once makes it unlikely Plaintiff

will be able to present thoughtful arguments about each discovery request he is moving on. The Court's Discovery Standing Order does not limit the number of joint discovery letter briefs that litigants can file, but it does limit the length of each one. The idea is that litigants will figure out how many arguments can be satisfactorily presented in a particular joint discovery letter brief – just like how they deal with any other page limit.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 8, 2025


THOMAS S. HIXSON
United States Magistrate Judge